The University of Chicago

GERBERT DE MONTREUIL AS A WRITER OF GRAIL ROMANCE: AN INVESTIGATION OF THE DATE AND THE MORE IMMEDIATE SOURCES OF THE CONTINUATION OF *PERCEVAL*

A PART OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE HUMANITIES IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF ROMANCE LANGUAGES
AND LITERATURES

1939

By
AMIDA STANTON

Private Edition, Distributed by
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
1942

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/IA41544324_0093

CHAPTER IV

THE DATE OF COMPOSITION AS JUDGED BY INTERNAL EVIDENCE

In the absence of other documentation, the ultimate source of information as to the dates of Gerbert's works will have to be looked for in the poems themselves. Before an examination of the text of the Continuation is entered upon, however, it will be well to take cognizance of the findings already reached by scholars.

Professor Buffum in the preface to his edition of the Violette proposes 1227-1229 as the date of that poem,[1] but does not attempt to assign a date for the Continuation of Perceval.[2] Nor as yet does the edition of the Continuation by Professor Mary Williams afford guidance; for the critical notes, which are to accompany the text, are still awaiting publication.[3]

Among scholars who have treated of the works of Gerbert, Adolf Birch-Hirschfeld is the first to state with definiteness that of the two long poems the Continuation of Perceval is the earlier.[4] Having postulated for the Violette the date 1225, Professor Birch-Hirschfeld set for the Continuation the period between 1220 and

---

[1]("Société des anciens textes francais"; Paris: Honoré Champion, 1928), p. LVII.

[2]Neither does he assign a date for the fabliau, "De Groignet et de Petit," which he attributes, likewise, to Gerbert de Montreuil. In comparing it with the Violette, however, he goes so far as to say:

"Si les deux poèmes sont du même auteur, G. ("Groignet") paraît antérieur à V." (Romania, LIII [1927], p. 560).

[3]Miss Williams generously offered for consultation in the course of the present study, the loan of the unpublished part of her edition of the text. Unfortunately, the material had already left her hands, and the necessary delays attendant upon obtaining it through the directors and the publishers of the "Classiques français du moyen âge" have prevented its being available for the present discussion.

[4]In point of fact, it is Gerbert himself who, in two passages, virtually establishes the chronology of his own writings. In the Continuation, he enumerates the episodes in his Perceval

1225.[1]

Some ten years later, Gaston Paris, commenting on Gerbert's part of the Continuation, wrote that it was composed not far from the time that Manessier's Continuation was written.[2] Later, he cited the author of Durmart as "un contemporain sans doute un peu plus âgé, et probablement un compatriote de Gui de Cambrai, de Gerbert de Montreuil, et de Raoul de Houdenc."[3] In his manual he gives definiteness to these generalities by saying of Manessier: ". . . . il écrivait vers 1220 pour Jeanne de Flandre, petite-nièce du comte Philippe sous les auspices duquel le poème avait été commencé."[4] This remark, coupled with his previous observation, would fix the date of the Gerbert Continuation, likewise, at about 1220.

The continuator Manessier himself, by a vague allusion to his patroness, the Countess Jeanne of Flanders, in the concluding lines of his Continuation,[5] would make it possible for his romance to have been written at any time between 1211 and 1244.[6]

---

story that he has already developed and those that he contemplates writing (Vol. I, vss. 6996-7019); in the opening lines of the Violette, on the contrary, he informs his patrons that the new contes biaus et delitables, which he is about to relate,

N'est pas de la Reonde Table,
Dou Roi Artu ne de ses gens
(vss. 34-35).

It is justifiable to infer that in these few lines the poet has in mind his own Continuation, and that he is thus announcing that his new romance will not deal, as did his previous romance, with adventures of Arthur's knights.

[1]Die Sage vom Gral; ihre Entwicklung und dichterische ausbildung in Frankreich und Deutschland im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert (Leipzig, 1877), p. 119.

[2]Histoire littéraire de la France, XXX, 42.

[3]Ibid., p. 153.

[4]Littérature française au moyen âge (5e éd.; Paris, 1914), § 59.

[5]Perceval le Gallois ou le Conte du Graal, ed. Charles Potvin ("Société des bibliophiles belges"; Mons, 1866-1871), VI, 157-158, n.

[6]It is true that Maurice Wilmotte places a different interpretation on Manessier's lines (Le Poème du Graal et ses auteurs (Paris: E. Droz, 1930), pp. 71-73). His reading of them, however, would not alter substantially the limitations of date as set by Manessier's allusion to his patroness. Moreover, the general thesis advanced by M. Wilmotte in his work has been definitely refuted, notably by Ferdinand Lot ("Les Auteurs du Conte du Graal," Romania, LVII [1931], 117-136).

Nevertheless, despite the indefinite reference of Manessier, the majority of scholars since the time of Gaston Paris have accepted the Manessier Continuation as belonging to the earlier part of the Countess Jeanne's reign in Flanders, with the poem of Gerbert, therefore, appearing not much later. As early as 1877, in fact, Herr Birch-Hirschfeld had summed up the case of all the continuators:

> Es würden also die drei Fortsetzungen von Chrestiens Gedichte etwa in diesem Jahren verfasst sein:
> c. 1195 (wahrscheinlich noch einige Jahre früher) die Fortsetzung Gautiers de Doulens,
> c. 1220 die Fortsetzung Manessiers,
> c. 1225 (oder einige Jahre früher) die Fortsetzung Gerberts de Monstreuil.[1]

A decade after Gaston Paris, Maurice Wilmotte indicated a different *terminus a quo* for the Continuation of *Perceval*, by pointing out what he considers borrowings on Gerbert's part from the prose *Tristan*,[2] a work which may have appeared as late as 1230.[3] The long adventure, which he cites, is obviously inspired by a *Tristan* story, but not necessarily by the prose *Tristan*, in which, as a matter of fact, no such episode occurs. A somewhat comparable adventure, however, is to be found in the *Tristrant* of Eilhart von Oberge, a work of the twelfth century that is supposedly based upon a lost French model.[4]

---

[1] *Loc. cit.*

[2] "Gerbert de Montreuil et les écrits qui lui sont attribués," *Bulletin de l'Académie Royale de Belgique*, I (1900), 175.

[3] E. Löseth dates the work between 1215 and 1230 (*Le Roman en prose de Tristan, le roman de Palamède et la compilation de Rusticien de Pise: analyse critique d'après les manuscrits de Paris* [Paris, 1891], p. XXIV). Joseph Bédier dates it 1230 (Thomas, *Le Roman de Tristan* ["Société des anciens textes français"; Paris, 1905], II, 309).

[4] Ed. Franz Lichtenstein ("Quellen und Forschungen zur Sprach-und Culturgeschichte der germanischen Völker," XIX; Strasbourg, 1877). These resemblances have several times been made a subject of comment by scholars. The most complete comparison of the analogies has been made by Gertrude Schoepperle Loomis (*Tristan and Isolt: a Study of the Sources of the Romance* ["New York University: Ottendorfer Memorial Series of Germanic Monographs"; Frankfurt a. M. and London, 1913] I, 36-37, 239-240, II, 283-287). Wolfgang Golther ("*Tristan und Isolde*" *in den Dichtungen des Mittelalters und der Neuen Zeit* [Leipzig: S. Herzel, 1907], pp. 228 ff.) has, also, contributed to the subject.

In 1910, E. Brugger, in one of the most thoughtful studies yet made of the question, took issue with the generally accepted theories as to the dates of Manessier and Gerbert:

> Birch-Hirschfeld gibt als Datum für Gerberts Perceval "gegen 1225" an; aber auch bei ihm ist dies Datum von demjenigen Manessiers abhängig, den er um 1220 schreiben lässt, was nach meiner Aussicht zu spät ist.[1]

Herr Brugger's argument is that Manessier's patroness would not have waited until the end of her reign to ask the poet to complete a romance begun for Philip of Flanders, to whose title she had succeeded, that more probably, soon after her accession in 1211, she would have invited Manessier to set to work, and that 1211 is, therefore, approximately the date for the beginning of Manessier's Continuation, with Gerbert's poem following somewhat later.

Briefly summarized then, exception being made of the postulation of M. Wilmotte for 1230, the dates thus far proposed by scholars for Gerbert's Continuation would lie between 1212, the widest possible limit for E. Brugger's theory, and 1225. But the conclusions arrived at are based upon the internal evidence taken from Manessier's poem, not from the Continuation of Gerbert.

It remains, therefore, to examine the Continuation itself in order to ascertain whether or not the text of that poem confirms the opinion thus far advanced by scholars.

Gerbert's Choice of Subject

If, as in the case of the Violette, Gerbert composed the Continuation of Perceval under the patronage of the Countess Marie de Ponthieu, his choice of theme and the development of one of his motifs may constitute a first indication of date.

According to all reckoning, Gerbert wrote his romance either shortly before or during the period when the husband of the countess was living in exile in England. It might then be with deliberate reference to that exile that the continuator chose as setting for his romance the British Isles, and as subject-matter, deeds of prowess that redound to the greatness of British knights and the British King Arthur.

Furthermore, in the course of the romance, Gerbert,

---

[1] Zeitschrift für Französische Sprache und Litteratur, XXXVI[2] (1910), 52, n. 41.

departing from French literary tradition, makes of Perceval an ancestor of the Swan Knight and the house of Bouillon. Both the Countess Marie and her husband traced their ancestry back to the Swan Knight through the house of Bouillon, the line of the countess coming through Walbertus de Pontivi,[1] that of her husband through the brother of Godefroid de Bouillon, Witasse, of whom Simon was a direct descendant.[2] Thus, the poet would have been paying a double compliment, first, to his patroness, and, second, to the exiled husband, whom Gerbert dared not openly name, yet whose graces he was politic enough to seek. Such a compliment would have been most appropriate between 1225, when hope of the count's ultimate pardon and return was beginning to take form, and 1230, the year that saw the end of his exile. Admittedly, the point is debatable, but, if accepted, it provides a possible date, 1225-1230, as a working hypothesis upon which to begin an investigation.

The Cordelois

A fairly definite indication of date occurs in a passage in which the allegory of a Grail adventure is being interpreted to Perceval by his uncle, the Hermit King Elyas Anaïs. The explanation, begun in serious vein, turns into an amusing diatribe against irreverent church-goers who interrupt mass with their whispered conversations about crops and markets, and who urge the priest to hurry through his droning so that they may go home to their dinners. Gerbert has a fine scorn for such godless worshippers:

> Teus gens ne sont pas el dangier
> De Dieu, qui onques ne recroient
> De mal faire et assez plus croient
> Qu'en Dieu en lor grans pances lees,
> Si n'ont pas letres seelees [3]
> De vivre plus que cordelois.

---

[1] Lamberti Ardensis, Historia comitum Ghisnensium ("Monumenta Germaniae historica," Tome XXIV), pp. 550-551, 557.

[2] For documentation, cf. H. Pigeonneau, Le Cycle de la croisade et de la famille de Bouillon (Thèse présentée à la Faculté des Lettres de Paris; Saint-Cloud: Mme. Vve Eugène Belin, 1887), pp. 158-159.

[3] Continuation of Perceval, Vol. II, vss. 8692-8697.

His mention of the Cordeliers provides a tangible reference as to date. Their order was established in France by the papal bull of Honorius III, dated November 29, 1223.[1]

Just when Gerbert's acquaintance with the order began, it would be difficult to say.[2] The casual tone of his allusion indicates that, at least, the Cordeliers were no longer a novelty to him. At the same time, his half-contemptuous tone shows that they had not yet attained the position they held later under the stimulus of some of their own gifted leaders, and under the encouragement of royal patronage. His declaration that they had no letters patent for existence would seem to refer to a period in their early history when the rule of their order was actually in question.

Such a period existed soon after the death of Francis of Assisi, in 1226, when the Franciscans, ceasing to follow the simple maxims of their order, invoked as final authority in matters of discipline and policy the testamento of their dead leader. Their subrogation of a personal document for the rule of an order roused open discussion, which did not end until Gregory IX, in 1230, defined the rule of the Franciscans and declared the testamento, to which they had attached authority, to be of no binding force.

---

[1]Some early historians, members of the order, mention the establishment of a convent at Angers in 1216 (the year of the birth of the order in Italy) and the establishment within the next seven years of five other Franciscan convents in different parts of France. Lavisse, however, warns against giving credence to such early dates (Histoire de France depuis ses origines jusqu'à la Révolution [Paris: Hachette, 1901], III, pt. 1, 360). The caution of Lavisse is borne out by the account given in the Cambridge Medieval History (Vol. VI, ed. C. W. Previté-Orton [New York: Macmillan, 1929], p. 732) of some abortive attempts in 1219 and thereafter to send Franciscan missionaries into Provence, Gascony, Germany, Hungary, and Spain. According to Thomas of Eccleston, even in 1224, there was still but a small handful of Franciscans in Paris (Monumenta franciscana I, ed. J. S. Brewer ["Rerum Britannicorum Medii Aevi scriptores"; London: Longman, Green etc., 1855], IV, 36-37).

[2]By the end of the eleventh century, the dependencies of the powerful counts of Ponthieu were already well dotted with abbeys and priories, largely Cistercian and Benedictine, or of the orders of Clairvaux and of the Prémontrés (Du Cange, Histoire des comtes de Ponthieu et de Montreuil, ed. M. l'Abbé A. LeSueur ["Mémoires de la Société d'Émulation d'Abbeville"; Abbeville, 1917], VIII, 101-104).

In 1223, according to the records of the order, a Franciscan priory was installed at Sées, and by 1233, there were Franciscan convents in existence at Amiens, Soissons, Senlis, Compiègne, Noyon, and neighboring places (Lavisse, loc. cit.).

Gerbert's comment, pertinent after the death of Francis of Assisi, in 1226, was no longer applicable in 1230, when the pope had established the rule of their order. The years 1226 and 1230, therefore, constitute the first indications of a terminus a quo and a terminus ad quem for the Continuation of Perceval. The poem could not, in any event, antedate the establishment of the Franciscan order in France, in 1223; there is strong likelihood that it was composed between 1226 and 1230.

Meanwhile, Gerbert's satire against irreverent parishioners finds a curious echo in a feud that raged during the first third of the thirteenth century in the commune of Saint-Valéry-sur-Somme near Abbeville between the parishioners and the abbot of Saint-Valéry. The quarrel rose with regard to sums due the abbey and payable in produce. The parishioners rebelled at what they considered exorbitant demands on the part of the abbot. The entire commune took up the quarrel. The Abbé de Saint-Valéry issued wholesale excommunications. The citizens parried by surrounding the abbey and trying to starve the abbot into granting them absolution. Eventually, the abbot and his chapter came out of the abbey in solemn procession. A waiting mob attacked them with stones, whips, flails, and whatever other instruments came to hand. The monks fled for protection to the house of the curé de Saint-Martin. The mob threatened to burn the house. Before the disorder subsided, much damage was done to abbey property.

How great a part exaggeration and high feeling play in the extravagant accounts of the feud written by early churchmen must be left to conjecture. It is true, nevertheless, that the archives of Abbeville contain a bull issued in 1232 by Gregory IX, and addressed to Robert de Dreux, seigneur de Saint-Valéry, ordering the rebellious parishioners under pain of excommunication to make amends to the abbot of Saint-Valéry for damage done to persons and to property, and, also, to accede to whatever other terms the abbot should see fit to impose.[1]

Gerbert's satire deals obviously with local conditions. In fact, it is in that very regard that it differs from an episode in the Perlesvaus with which it, otherwise, presents a striking

---

[1] F. C. Louandre, Histoire d'Abbeville et du comté de Ponthieu jusqu'en 1789 (Abbeville: Aug. Alexandre, 1883-1884), I, 139-141, and Appendix, pp. 406-414.

For a less violent altercation at Saint-Riquier, over crop rents due, see p. 369.

parallel.[1] It is highly probable that living in the vicinity of Saint-Valéry, Gerbert was familiar with the situation there. It is possible that his knowledge of the state of affairs in Saint-Valéry suggested the point for his satire. If that be the case, he is recording the rumblings of a quarrel that did not reach the point of violence until 1231. This would mean that he was writing the passage in question at about the time suggested by the allusion to the Cordelois.

The Castle of Coucy

A further hint as to date is offered by the description of a castle on the Pui de Montesclair, in which a damsel, the Pucele au Cercle d'Or, is enduring a siege:

> Et d'autre part cele riviere
> Fu li chastiaus, ce m'est aviere,
> Du Pui de Montesclair laiens,
> Dont il parloient tantes gens:
> Drois est, car molt est biaus et riches.
> Il ne fu pas avers ne chiches
> Qui la fist faire et deviser.
> Qui Couchi porroit aviser
> Il porroit bien dire de lui
> Qu'il fu conpassés a celui
> De murs, de tors riches et fors.[2]

The Coucy to which Gerbert compares the castle of the beleaguered maiden is evidently not the stout fortress originally built by an archbishop to fend off the Normans, and later acquired by the Coucy family.[3] From the nature of the description, it is obvious that the poet can be referring in this passage only to that more imposing château which Enguerrand III le Grand de Coucy had

---

[1] The adventures of the Beste glatissant and the Priests at the Cross (Le Haut Livre du Gral, Perlesvaus, ed. William A. Nitze and T. Atkinson Jenkins [University of Chicago Press, 1932-1937], Vol. I, ll. 5486-5539, 5975-6026; II, 134-138). Professor Nitze considers that Gerbert's localization of the incident, taken in conjunction with other evidence that the verses afford, is an indication that the passage containing the allegory did not originate with Gerbert, and that, therefore, the poet may have borrowed the story from the Perlesvaus, the only other known romance in which it exists. The date that Professor Nitze establishes for the Perlesvaus (Vol. II, p. 89) marks the prose romance as definitely the earlier of the two works.

[2] Continuation of Perceval, Vol. II, vss. 9309-9319.

[3] Viollet-le-Duc, Description du Château de Coucy (2d ed.; Paris, 1861), p. 1.

built about the older structure.[1] Of this castle Viollet-le-Duc writes:

> C'est à l'époque des rêves ambitieux d'Enguerrand III qu'il faut faire remonter la construction du château magnifique dont nous voyons encore les ruines gigantesques. Le château de Coucy dut être élevé très-rapidement ainsi que l'enceinte de la ville qui l'avoisine, de 1225 à 1230. Le caractère de la sculpture, les profils, ainsi que la construction, ne permettent pas de lui assigner une date plus ancienne ni plus récente.[2]

The date established by Viollet-le-Duc for the castle, if correct, narrows somewhat the terminus a quo for Gerbert's poem.

In so far as archeologists and architects are concerned, the time postulated by the distinguished Frenchman is not open to question; they assert that the date 1225 to 1230 is proved by the carvings and decorative motifs of the new Coucy and by certain structural details that belong to a sharply delimited architectural period, which was at its height toward the third decade of the thirteenth century, but of which the cathedral of Soissons presents almost the only example before 1225.[3] One would like to

---

[1] The Abbé Suger (Vie de Louis le Gros, suivie de l'histoire du roi Louis VII, éd. A. Molinier [Paris, 1887], chap. xxx, pp. 114-115) describes the partial dismantling of the original castle at the time Louis le Gros defeated the rebel Thomas II de Coucy under its walls.

Ordericus Vitalis (Ecclesiasticae historiae, Liber VI [Andretetia Parisiorum, 1619], Vol. II, 619c) and Benoît de Sainte-More, following him (Chronique des ducs de Normandie, ed. Francisque Michel [Paris, 1836], Vol. I, vss. 14057-14062, 14179-14184, 14270-14274), refer to the original castle in terms that reveal it as a stronghold of the early type, possessing a central tower with protecting walls.

The Mort de Garin le Loherain and Richard le Pèlerin's Chanson d'Antioche, poems in which Thomas de Couci and Angorrand II de Coucy figure prominently, contain no reference to the famous castle--a fair indication that the magnificent structure was not then in existence.

[2] Viollet-le-Duc, op. cit., p. 5. (In the first edition of his Dictionnaire raisonné de l'architecture française [under the article, "Château," Vol. III, p. 108], Viollet-le-Duc gave the date "de 1220 à 1230." The year 1225 belongs to later printings of his work.)

[3] Eugène Lefèvre-Pontalis, director of the Société Française d'Archéologie (Le Château de Coucy ["Petites Monographies des grands édifices de la France"; Paris, s.d.], pp. 48-49), describes these characteristic and recognizable features of the castle. For a more technical and exhaustive discussion, see "château," "Coucy," "donjon," "forteresse," in E. Viollet-le-Duc's Dictionnaire raisonné de l'architecture française du XI^e^ au XVI^e^ siècle. That

add the concrete evidence of public archives and records to the silent testimony of towers and arches; but, unfortunately, no official documents concerning Enguerrand III and the new Coucy have thus far come to light.[1] Confirmation of the date of the rebuilding of the castle must rest, therefore, on such meager data as are offered by the life and times of Enguerrand III.

For three reasons, the remodeling of Coucy is unlikely to have been undertaken during the lifetime of Philip Augustus. First, Philip did not encourage castle-building on the part of his turbulent lords; on the contrary, he sought to curb their power by refusing them grants to construct and to fortify castles, and by commandeering or by destroying, when possible, strongholds in their possession.[2] Second, throughout the reign of Philip

---

1225 to 1230 is the only date accepted today by authorities on the subject may be verified by consultation of any standard history of architecture.

[1]M. Philippe Lauer, librarian of the department of manuscripts of the Bibliothèque Nationale, who undertook an investigation for the director of the Société Française d'Archéologie, is authority for the statement that the archives of the Department of the Aisne afford no data on the subject (Eugène Lefèvre-Pontalis, op. cit., p. 22).

[2]Within little more than the space of a decade three of Enguerrand de Coucy's peers had been obliged to surrender their castles to the custody of Philip Augustus to be used at his discretion and, if he deemed expedient, to be garrisoned by his troops: in 1211, the Comte de Perche; in 1218, the Sire de Montmorenci; in 1223, Enguerrand's own nephew, the Comte de Dreux (The cases are cited in Ernest Lavisse, Histoire de France [Paris, 1901], Vol. III[1], p. 206).

How jealously Philip Augustus safeguarded his power against encroachment may be inferred from the terms he imposed in 1214 upon his vassal and former ward, the countess Jeanne of Flanders, after the defection of her husband at Bouvines (Guillelmi Armorici, De gestis Philippi Augusti ["Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France"; Paris, 1878, Tome XVII, 105b, anno 1214]):

"Ego J. Comitissa Flandriae et Haynoniae notum facio omnibus praesentes literas inspecturis, quod ego juravi domino meo illustri Regi Francorum, quod ego tradam ei vel ejus mandato . . . . et quod diuri faciam fortericias de Valencenis, de Ypra, de Audenarde et de Casello ita quod sint dirutae ad ejus domini Regis voluntatem, neque reaedificabuntur nisi per ejus beneplacitum; et omnes aliae fortericiae Flandriae in eo puncto in quo modo sunt remanebunt, neque aliquo modo infortiabuntur, neque aliae fortericiae poterunt fieri, nisi per ejusdem domini Regis beneplacitum hoc fieret."

Three years before, when it had been a question of affiancing the wealthy countess, Philip Augustus had accorded her hand to Ferdinand of Portugal in preference to Enguerrand le Grand de

Augustus, Enguerrand's own activities, which were largely military in character, led him far afield, and left him little leisure to execute a plan of such magnitude as the rebuilding of Coucy;[1] whereas, between 1223 and 1230, his interests lay nearer home, and could conceivably have allowed him opportunity to occupy himself with such a project.[2] Third, over a period of years, as chronicles

---

Coucy, who was, also, a suitor. Enguerrand was not in good favor, records one of the chroniclers of the betrothal:

Car il estoit fel et creueus
Et despissans et orgilleus.

(Philippe Mouskès, Chronique rimée, ed. le Baron de Reiffenberg, "Collection des chroniques belges inédites" [Bruxelles, 1836], Vol. II, vss. 20773-20780).

[1]In 1211, he took part in the campaign against the Albigensians in Provence (Petri Vallium Sarnaii Monarchi, Historia Albigensium ["Recueil des historiens de la Gaule et de la France"; Paris, 1878], Tome XIX[c], 43[e], and 47[b]).

At the time of the battle of Bouvines, he was one of the "maison militaire du roi," a picked mounted company (Lavisse, op. cit., Vol. III[1], p. 190). Guillaume le Breton in his Philippidos, l'Anonyme de Béthune, and Philippe Mouskés all contribute details.

In 1216, he was under sentence of excommunication by Pope Honorius III for having abetted Louis in his expedition against the English (Epistolarum Honorii Papae III, Lib. I ["Recueil des historiens de la Gaule et de la France"; Vol. XVIII], 613[c], 614[a], and note). The excommunication was not lifted until 1218 (Ibid., Lib. II, ep. 1045, 658d and e, 659a). The pope's displeasure was heightened by the still active hostility of the canons of Laon toward Enguerrand who had affronted their dean in 1209 and who had been branded by him as hominem pestiferum dominum de Coucy, ministrum non Antiochi, sed antichristi. . . . .

In 1219, he was one of the company of twelve hundred knights, composed largely of the heroes of Bouvines, who were assembled by Louis to aid him in making good his claim to the English crown (Guillaume le Maréchal, comte de Striguil et de Pembroke, ed. Paul Meyer ["Société de l'histoire de France"; Paris, 1891-1901], Vol. I, vss. 2123-2143).

[2]In 1223, he writes to Thibaut de Champagne to inform him of the marriage of the sister of the countess of Flanders to Guillaume de Dampierre (Epistolarum Honorii Papae III, Lib. II, An. 1223, § 738, note).

In 1224, he is one of the witnesses of the privileges granted at La Rochelle by Hugues de Lusignan to the citizens of Oléron (Arthur Giry, Les Etablissements de Rouen, II, 74-75).

In 1226, he attends the assembly at Bourges, convoked to launch a further crusade against the Albigensians (Gesta Ludovici VIII, Francorum Regis, auctore Nicolas de Braia ["Recueil des historiens de la Gaule et de la France," Vol. XIX], 344[e]). In November of the same year, he is one of the signers of the circular letter inviting subjects to the sacre of Louis IX at Rheims (Teulet, Layettes du Trésor des chartes, Tome II, no. 1823). With his two brothers, Thomas and Raoul, he is present at the coronation

amply show,[1] Philip Augustus manifested open distrust of Enguerrand de Coucy. Under such circumstances it is hardly reasonable to suppose that he would have permitted his naughty subject to build so menacing a challenge to royal power as the new Coucy would have offered. It appears more probable, therefore, that the rehabilitation of the original Norman stronghold was not entered upon until after Philip's death, in July, 1223. If that be the case, since Gerbert's allusion is to a castle already completed, we arrive again, though by a different route, at approximately the date indicated by Viollet-le-Duc for the rehabilitation of the castle, 1225.

The mention of Coucy, coupled with the allusion to the Cordeliers, provides a *terminus a quo* for Gerbert's poem. Until further evidence is forthcoming, it may safely be asserted that the Continuation of *Perceval* could not have been written before the remodeling of the castle in 1225, and it is conceivable that it was not written until some time thereafter--1226, or 1227.[2]

---

ceremonies for the new king at Rheims (Philippe Mouskés, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, vss. 27646-27658).

In 1228, he enters the conspiracy of the barons against Louis IX and the regency, and later allows himself to be named as the noble who is to take the king's place on the throne (*Chronique de Reims*, ed. Louis Paris ["Société de l'histoire de France"; Paris, 1837], chap. xxii, pp. 304, 305, 308).

In 1230, he takes part with other barons in a quarrel against the counts of Flanders and Champagne (Matthew of Paris, *Chronica majora* ed. H. R. Luard ["Rolls Series" no. 57], III, 195).

[1]Amongst others, cf. *supra*, pp. 28 f., n. 2. Cf., also, the conspicuous part which Enguerrand le Grand felt himself obliged to take in the royal communion supper before the battle of Bouvines, in order to allay the king's suspicions of his loyalty (*Récits d'un ménestrel de Reims*, ed. Natalis de Wailly ["Société de l'histoire de France"; Paris, 1876], p. 148); and the formal pledge which, under Philip's compulsion, the powerful Comte de Nevers gave, not to affiance his daughter, Agnes,

". . . . Agnetem filiam nostram . . . . maxime alicui filiorum Johannis quondam Regis Angliae, ne Theobaldo de Campania, nec filio Ducis Burgundiae, nec Inguerranno de Cuciaco . . . ."

(Guillelmi-Armorici, *Philippidos*, *Liber* X ["Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France"; Paris, 1878], *Tome* XVII, 243c and note b, *anno* 1215).

Enguerrand's marriage to the sister of Emperor Otto, of Germany, arch-foe of Philip on the field of Bouvines, probably added little to Philip's confidence in his vassal's loyalty.

[2]In the *Violette* (vs. 1210), Gerbert mentions Coucy as the place from which Euriaut's fictitious lover has supposedly stolen a gown for her. The casual tone of the poet, in this instance,

The Duc d'Osteriche

Further confirmation of the date of the terminus ad quem may be seen in another indication, which, likewise, the poem provides, although, unfortunately, in an episode that, elsewhere, shows traces of borrowing. The poet writes:

> De trestot l'avoir qui apent
> Au duc qui sire est d'Osteriche
> Ne feroit on huchel si riche.[1]

The reference to a duc d'Osteriche is not unique with Gerbert de Montreuil, for both Chrétien and Manessier contain a similar mention.[2] Gerbert's originality consists in converting, by means of a change from past to present time, a literary commonplace into a definite allusion to a contemporary. It is a device that is familiar to him; he uses it, in modified form, in the Violette, when he transfers to that poem, from the Guillaume de Dole and the Comte de Poitiers, characters representing an earlier decade, but whom he converts into figures of his own generation.

At the time Gerbert was writing, there actually was a duke of Austria whose reputation for wealth was proverbial, Leopold VI, der Glorreicher, duke of Austria from 1198 to 1230, son of the duke Leopold, who, in 1192, had delivered Richard the Lion-Hearted over to Emperor Henry for ransom.

As a crusader in the Holy Land, Leopold der Glorreicher early acquired a reputation for largesse by his generous gifts to those who rendered him service. Later, the immense impetus he gave to commerce and industry in his own duchy of Austria, the handsome edifices with which he enriched Vienna, his munificence as a patron of arts and learning, contributed still further to the idea of his

---

would indicate increasing familiarity with Coucy. His vague allusion is equally applicable either to the castle itself or to the town clustering below it.

That Gerbert, if he were a pensioner of Marie de Ponthieu's, should be acquainted with Coucy is not strange, as the third daughter of the countess was the widow of Raoul de Coucy, eldest son of Enguerrand (E Chronico Alberici Monachi Trium Fontium ["Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France, Vol. XXI], p. 626,k; 627,b).

[1] Continuation of Perceval, Vol. II, vss. 10718-10720.

[2] Yvain, vss. 1040-1042; Manessier, vss. 41646-41649. A duchesse d'Osteriche, moreover, is one of the characters in the Roman de la Rose ou de Guillaume de Dole, ed. G. Servois ("Société des anciens textes français"; Paris, 1893, vs. 537).

wealth.[1]

But what probably attracted Gerbert's attention to him is that, far more than for his wealth, Leopold der Glorreicher was famed for his generosity toward Minnesingers and for the handsome gifts by which he attracted them to his court. Heinrich von Osterdingen, Reinmar der Ältere, and Walther von der Vogelweide are among the pensioners of Leopold's bounty, who sang at his court, and who wrote poems in praise of their patron.[2]

Leopold's generosity toward Minnesingers is a trait that alone would have endeared him to the minstrel Gerbert, who no doubt had some such liberal patron in mind when he wrote in the Continuation:

> . . . . Dieu qui terre et mer
> Estora doint honor a ceus
> Ki onorent les menestreus.[3]

It is probably not without intent that the French minstrel includes in the same episode the allusion to the duke of Austria and the devout but politic prayer for those who show honor to minstrels.

While on an embassy to Italy in an attempt to effect a reconciliation between the emperor and Pope Gregory IX, Leopold VI fell ill at San Germano. He died there July 26, 1230.

If Leopold VI is the duke to whom Gerbert alludes, then the Continuation of Perceval must have been completed before July 26, 1230.[4]

Thus we have the following limits for the dating of the Continuation of Perceval: the years during which the testamento

---

[1]For statements concerning him, see: Sächsische Weltchronik ("Monumenta Germaniae Historica"; Hanover and Leipzig, 1909), 358, 359, 375; Österreichische Chronik (Ibid.), Buch III, pp. 101-103; Annales Frisacenses (Ibid. [Scriptorum], Vol. XXIV, 25; Zwettler Reimchronik (cited in a modern version by H. M. Richter, Geistesströmungen [Berlin, 1875], p. 13); L'Art de vérifier les dates (Paris, 1819), XVII, 27-29; Louis Léger, Histoire de l'Autriche-Hongrie depuis les origines jusqu'à l'année 1878 (Paris, 1879), pp. 130-131; Philippe Mouskes, op. cit., Vol. II, vss. 27839-27845, 28113-28116, 28559-28561.

[2]For typical allusions, see Walther von der Vogelweide, Gedichte, ed. Karl Lachmann (4th ed.; Berlin, 1864), pp. 24, 25, 28, 31-32, 35, 36.

[3]Vss. 11974-11976.

[4]Gerbert's allusion to the Duke of Austria can hardly be applicable to the succeeding duke, Frederick II, the Bellicose, son of Leopold VI and last of his line. On acceding to Leopold's

of Francis of Assisi superseded the rule of the order; the year in which the construction of the new Coucy was completed; the year in which Leopold VI of Austria died. The evidence is slender, unless it has the support of other passages in the poem. Yet, if it is to be depended upon, we may safely assert that the Continuation of Perceval was not begun before 1226, possibly not before 1227, and that it was completed before July, 1230.[1]

The Vesper Service at Carlion

Although no other passages in the Continuation offer such precision of date as do the two last cited, there is, nevertheless, additional evidence that the poem approaches within reasonable distance of the years designated.

Amongst passages in which such indications occur are two descriptions of ceremonies: the one, an elaborate vesper service held at Carlion; the other, the wedding of Perceval and Blancheflor at Belrepaire. In the group of prelates present at these two functions we seem to discern some actual personalities of Gerbert's own

---

title, Frederick found that the officers of his father's household not only had sacked the ducal treasury, but also had made away with the duke's personal effects. After months of struggle, Frederick wrested from them a fraction of the seized possessions. Thereafter, his incessant wars, not always successful ones, left him little leisure to build up a reputation for wealth, although he seems to have acquired one for avarice. His territory was ravaged in 1232 by Wenceslas III, of Bohemia; in 1237, he lost his duchy of Austria, and found himself reduced to the rank of a private citizen. Eventually he regained his title and made some headway against his enemies, but never lived to know peace. He died June 15, 1246, in battle against the King of Hungary (L. Léger, loc. cit.; L'Art de vérifier les dates, XVII, 28-29).

[1]If Professor Buffum's postulation of 1227-1229 is accepted as the actual date of the Violette, then the composition of that poem would seem to be almost coincident with the composition of the Continuation, 1226-1230. In view of the number of identical passages in the two works, such an hypothesis is not inadmissible. It is not, however, the only one possible, since the editor of the Violette agrees with its earlier commentator, Gaston Paris, that the work might have been composed as late as 1239-1243. The arguments in favor of the years 1227-1229 are clearly set forth in the preface to the Violette (pp. XL-LXXIII), and, therefore, need no recapitulation. On the other hand, the following factors argue for the period 1239-1243: allusions to a Count of Blois and his sister (vs. 114) who were non-existent in 1227, but who might well have been two of the six children born to the sole heiress to the title, Marie de Blois, after her marriage to Hugues V de Châtillon, in 1225; the broad hint of a love affair for a damoisele de Couchi (vss. 129-133), who was not yet born in 1227, but for whom a

day. To determine their identity becomes then important, as thereby further light may be cast upon the date of composition of the Continuation of Perceval.

For the first episode, the vesper service, the setting is, apparently, the royal chapel at Carlion. Great church dignitaries intone the offices before a concourse of titled persons.[1]

At the invitation of the Archbishop of Carlion, the archevesques d'Oriant[2] in company with the Archbishop of Dublin chants the vespers. On the right side of the choir stands the Bishop of Winchester,

Qui apris ert de bone escole[3]

and on the left, the Bishop of Nicole (Lincoln),

Qui molt bons clers et biaus estoit.[4]

The responses are intoned by the Archbishops of York and Berwick. On the following day, under the same distinguished

---

brilliant match was being made in 1239; a compliment addressed to the Count of Rousi (vs. 5915), who in 1237 married the fourth daughter of the Countess of Ponthieu; a reference to Marie de Ponthieu's return to prosperity and to her consequent peace of mind (vss. 6640-6648), an allusion which would have been appropriate in 1239-1243, but was premature in 1227-1229, when her husband was still in exile, when his lands were still forfeit to the crown, and when the countess herself had been obliged to hand over to Louis VIII four of the appanages of her own heritage of Ponthieu and renounce all her claims to Alençon in order to buy back the rest of her county confiscated by the king in 1225 under pretext that it had become the possession of her husband, the traitor, Simon de Dammartin, as Count of Ponthieu; an allusion to li quens de Pontiu (vs. 5922), which might have been undiplomatic in 1227 in the face of Louis VIII's recent pretensions, was safe enough in 1239.

Thus, although the preponderance of evidence still lies in favor of the years 1227-1229 for the composition of the Roman de la Violette, there is nothing in the date adduced by Douglas Buffum to preclude the possibility of the poem's having been written as late as 1239-1243. On the other hand, several facts which point to the later period distinctly lessen the probability of the poem's having been composed as early as 1227-1229.

[1]The Continuation of Perceval, Vol. I, vss. 3321-3366.

[2]Vs. 3323. (The same dignitary is later mentioned as l'archevesque de Cyriant [vs. 3361].)

[3]Vs. 3337.

[4]Vs. 3340.

auspices, matins and high mass are sung.[1]

In general setting and in context, this scene is reminiscent only of conventional literary motifs, typical of the matiere de Bretaigne; but by reason of the personages involved, it takes on an air of actuality which distinguishes it from comparable passages in other romances.[2]

L'Archevesques de Carlion

Concerning the most prominent figure in the vesper service, the Archbishop of Carlion, no historical details are available, for, at the time Gerbert was writing, the archbishopric at Carlion had ceased to exist.[3] To find precedent for use of the title, however, Gerbert need have gone no further than to the Historia Regum Britanniae or to the Brut. It is obvious that in using it the poet seeks merely to designate the prelate who is highest in Arthur's realm. Whether or not, in addition, the non-extant title bears an analogy to some great churchman of the Angevin monarchy, the politic continuator leaves us to determine.

Li Evesques de Nicole

Of the part which the bishops of Lincoln and of Winchester took in the services, the poet writes:

> Cil doi chantoient molt tres bien,
> Nes pooit on reprendre rien:
> Bons chans avoient et haus sons.[4]

---

[1]Vss. 3360-3366.

[2]An interesting point of comparison is afforded in a partial roster, compiled from the Patent Rolls, Royal Letters, and other official sources, of the King's counselors during the period of Henry III's minority, 1216-1227 (James F. Baldwin, "The Beginnings of the King's Council," Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, New Series, XIX [1905], 57-59). The list includes, among others, and with varying years of service: William the Marshal, Gualo the legate, and, later, his successor, Pandulf; Stephen Langton, Archbishop of Canterbury; Hubert de Burgh, justiciar; Walter de Gray, Archbishop of York; Henry, Archbishop of Dublin; Peter des Roches, Bishop of Winchester; Hugh of Wells, Bishop of Lincoln; Walter Mauclerc, Bishop of Carlisle. Such a list is evidence that, whether he availed himself of it or not, Gerbert had precedent for his conjunction of names.

[3]According to Giraldus Cambrensis (De Invectionibus, Lib. IV, pars II, ed. J. S. Brewer ["Master of the Rolls" series; London, 1861-1891], Vol. XXI3, p. 46), by 1198, the archbishopric of Carlion had been transferred to St. David's.

[4]Continuation of Perceval, vss. 3341-3343.

The characterization of li evesques de Nicole as a singer is significant, for, at least, two bishops of Lincoln were gifted with excellent voices, the great Saint Hugh of Lincoln, head of the see from 1186 to 1201, and Hugh of Wells, bishop from 1209 to 1235. Although Hugh of Wells was, according to one of his biographers, a "faire chaunter,"[1] his fame as a singer was far surpassed by that of Saint Hugh, who, even in his youth, had won praise for his excellent rendering of the monastic services, and who, as a prelate, was renowned both for his voice and for the splendid choirs that he maintained.[2] This bishop, born at Avalon, in Burgundy, was too celebrated not to have been known to Gerbert.[3] Moreover, memories of the great Hugh were revived when with fitting pomp he was canonized in 1220.[4]

L'Archevesques de Duveline

Of the Archbishop of Dublin, Gerbert records that he had come to Arthur's court as spokesman for Guillaume, king of a part of Ireland.[5] For this archbishop and also for Guillaume, two

---

[1]Francis Godwin, A Catalogue of the Bishops of England, since the First Planting of Christian Religion in the Island, Together with a Briefe History of Their Lives and Memorable Actions as Neere as can be Gathered out of Antiquity (London, 1601), p. 238.

[2]Magna vita S. Hugonis Episcopi, ed. James F. Dimock ("Master of the Rolls" series, no. 37; London, 1864), pp. 10-13. Jessie L. Weston suggested that Hugh of Lincoln might be the original for Gerbert's bishop (Romania, XXXV [1906], p. 523).

[3]Bishop Godwin (op. cit., p. 237) gives this account of the arrival of Hugh's body for burial at Lincoln at the time when King John and William the Lion of Scotland were holding parley there:

"The bodye was brought for burial at Lincoln when John of England and William, King of Scots, were mette there with an infinite number of the nobility of both realmes. . . . . The two kings, for the great reverence they bore unto his holynesse, would needes set their shoulders unto the beere, and helped to carry his coarse from the gates of the city until it come to the church. . . ."

In her history of John Lackland (London, 1902, p. 78), Kate Norgate does not bear out Bishop Godwin's statement, but this merely removes a graceful story from the realm of history into that of legend.

[4]Rogeri de Wendover, Liber qui dicitur Flores Historiarum, ed. Henry G. Hewlett ("Master of the Rolls" series, no. 84; London, 1887), II, 253.

[5]Continuation of Perceval, vss. 3329-3334.

possible identities may be predicated.

From 1212 to 1228, the archbishop of Dublin was Henry de Loundres. In his rôle, first as viceroy, later as justiciar for Ireland,[1] he acted as spokesman between the Irish and King John, and so might have served as model for the prelate of the Continuation.

Of greater poetic appeal, however, is the epic figure of an earlier archbishop, the patriotic Lorcan O'Toole, who occupied the see of Dublin from 1162 to 1180. Although his period of service precludes his being considered a contemporary of Gerbert's, he is linked, nevertheless, with the age in which Gerbert lived by the ceremony of his canonization under Pope Honorius III, in 1226,[2] not far from the time, therefore, when Gerbert must have been writing his Continuation of Perceval. Of him, even more truly than of Henry de Loundres, it could be said that he served as intermediary of an Irish sovereign, as his devotion to the cause of Roderick O'Conor, last of the Irish kings, is a matter of history.[3] Moreover, the final act of his life was one of service to the Irish monarch, for he died at the Abbey of Eu in Normandy while on his way to plead in person Roderick's cause before King Henry.[4] It is not improbable that his canonization in 1226, recalling incidents of his eventful life, may have moved Gerbert to perpetuate

---

[1]He held these offices from 1213 to 1224.

[2]David Wilkins, Concilia magnae Britanniae et Hiberniae (London, 1737), T. I, p. 619.
The ceremony, in the case of the archbishop of Dublin, had more than its usual significance, since Lorcan O'Toole was the first Irish prelate, living and working in Ireland, to receive papal canonization.

[3]King of Connaught and High King of Ireland (Annals of Ireland, ed. John T. Gilbert ["Master of the Rolls" series, no. 80; London, 1887], II, 267).

[4]Benedict, Abbot of Peterborough, Gesta regis Henrici Secundi, ed. William Stubbs ("Master of the Rolls" series, no. 49; London, 1867), I, 270.
Roger of Hoveden, Chronica magistri Rogeri de Houedene, ed. William Stubbs ("Master of the Rolls" series, no. 51; London, 1869), II, 253.
The circumstances of his death as given by the annalists are not borne out by Goddard H. Orpen (Ireland under the Normans, 1169-1216 [Oxford, 1911], II, 56-59), nor by Edmund Curtis (A History of Medieval Ireland from 1110 to 1513 [London, 1923], p. 98). Sir Goddard presents an unembellished picture of the Irish patriot, but since Gerbert, if he had this prelate in mind, was

in a line of his poem the memory of the archbishop's devotion.

Guillaumes, Rois d'une Partie des Irois

Equally prominent with the Archbishop of Dublin is the monarch he served:

> C'ert Guillaumes, qui estoit rois
> D'une partie des Irois.[1]

The name, Guillaumes, occurs but once in the poem, and may be only a literary recollection on Gerbert's part, since Wace in his long enumeration of the guests at Arthur's coronation, writes:

> Villamus i fu, rois d'Irlande.[2]

On the other hand, that it may have its source in historical fact is borne out, at least in part, by Gerbert's final mention of the Irish king at the moment when Madiex, cil a le Cote Maltaillie, defeated by Perceval, arrives to yield himself prisoner to Arthur sojourning in Dublin:

> Tant a les drois chemins tenus
> Qu'a Duveline en est venus.
> La tint li rois d'Yrlande cort,
> Et por miex essauchier sa cort
> Avoit le roi Artu mandé,
> Et tant proié et tant rové
> Que venus i estoit li rois,
> Artus li preus et li cortois.[3]

---

treating of him as judged by his contemporaries, we can afford to leave out of consideration the historian's probably accurate portrayal of him as a fallible man.

[1]Continuation of Perceval, vss. 3333-3334. In addition to the present scene in which his name is given, the Irish king is mentioned in two other passages: as one of four kings accompanying Arthur on a hunt for the blanc cherf au Noir Chevalier (vss. 1210-1223), and at his own royal court in Dublin. (Bibliothèque Nationale, fonds français, MS 12576, fol. 218, ro.)

[2]Le Roman de Brut, ed. Le Roux de Lincy (Rouen, 1836-1838), Vol. II, vs. 10573.

Giraldus Cambrensis, too, striving, perhaps, to build up a tradition of Irish homage due English kings, declares that Arthur, the renowned king of Britain, had kings of Ireland tributary to him (Opera, Topographia Hibernica, ed. James F. Dimock ["Master of Rolls" series, no. XXI^{5}; London, 1861-1891], cap. VIII, p. 148). Gillomarus, King of Ireland, with other kings of the isles, was reported to have come to Arthur's court at Caerleon (Expugnatio Hibernica, cap. VI, pp. 319-320).

[3]Bibliothèque Nationale, fonds français, MS 12576, fol. 218, ro., col. 3, vss. 19-26.

Paul Meyer suggested some years ago that the original for the figure Guillaume might be William the Marshal, Earl of Pembroke.[1] His conjecture is not illogical, for, as regent during the minority of Henry III, William the Marshal exercised all but royal powers.[2] Moreover, through his marriage with Isabel de Clare, he acquired in fief most of the honor of Leinster,[3] one of the provinces over which the four Irish kings had reigned.[4] That the fame of William the Marshal passed swiftly into legend is attested by the long biographical poem which bears his name and which, according to its editor, appeared about 1226.[5]

As to the bishoprics of York and Winchester, little can be said because of the scanty mention made of them by the poet himself. Gerbert may have had in mind either Geoffrey, bishop of York from 1207 to 1215, or his successor, Walter Gray (1217-1255). The head of the church at Winchester from 1204 to 1238 was Peter des Roches. His name occurs frequently in the pages of Guillaume le Maréchal.

The identity of the archevesque d'Orïant remains enigmatic. Possibly Gerbert recalled the visit, often mentioned by chroniclers, of Heraclius, Patriarch of Jerusalem, to Henry II; he may even have been using for a pattern an actual event, such as the coronation of Louis IX in 1226 at Rheims, of which Philippe Mouskés wrote:

> Virent a Rains plusior baron
> De lointain païs environ
> . . . . . .
> Si ot prélas et arcevesques,
> Abés et kanounes et vesques,
> Et li patriocles i vint
> De Jursalem, ensi avint.[6]

---

[1] Romania, XXXV (1906), editor's note, p. 523. His edition of the Histoire de Guillaume le Maréchal, comte de Striguil et de Pembroke, had been completed in 1901.

[2] "Rector nostri et regni nostri" is the title given him on the Patent Rolls. Cited by Kate Norgate, The Minority of Henry the Third (London, 1912), p. 71, n. 2.

[3] Histoire de Guillaume le Maréchal, vss. 9364-9371.

[4] Benedictus Abbas Petroburgensis, Gesta Regis Ricardi I, ed. William Stubbs ("Master of the Rolls" series, no. 49; London, 1867), Vol. II, p. 73.

[5] Vol. III, p. IX.

[6] Chronique rimée, Vol. II, vss. 27545-27546, 27553-27556.

Berwick, like Caerleon, had no archbishopric at this time, but throughout the thirteenth century, Berwick was well known for its monastic schools.

The Wedding of Perceval and Blancheflor

The second passage in Gerbert's Continuation, the description of the marriage of Perceval and Blancheflor, although filled with allusions that, seemingly, should throw light upon the date of the poem, on analysis, reduces itself largely to an enumeration of titles familiar in church history or in legend, and to some indirect literary references. The following dignitaries are mentioned as taking part in the various services attendant upon the marriage: the Archbishop of Landemeure, the bishops of Lumor (spelled also, Limor) and Lumeri: the archbishops of Rodas, of Dinas Clamadas, of Saint Andrieu en Escoche; the bishops of Cardueil, of Caradigan, of Cardif, of Morguan, of Saint Pol de Lion, of Carlion, of Saint Aaron en Gales.[1]

Aside from its interest, therefore, as a picture of domestic life and manners, the episode of the marriage of Perceval and Blancheflor offers relatively few points of concrete value in establishing a date for the poem. Nevertheless, it is significant that, with the exception of a few literary allusions, the enumeration of ecclesiastical seats is limited to those prominent in the history of the church during the first decades of the thirteenth century.

In the final analysis, both passages add corroborating facts to the proposed date of the Continuation. The vesper service at Carlion contains possible allusions to bishoprics and to famous persons having as inclusive dates the following periods: Lawrence O'Toole, Archbishop of Dublin, canonized in 1226, or Henry de Loundres, archbishop from 1212 to 1228; William the Marshal, about 1143-1219, with the Histoire de Guillaume le Maréchal appearing probably in 1226; Saint Hugh of Lincoln, canonized in 1220, or Hugh of Wells, bishop from 1209 to 1235; Peter des Roches, Bishop of Winchester from 1204 to 1238.

---

[1]Of the prelates listed, all either bear Celtic names or have Celtic associations. Most of the names are of frequent occurence in the pages of chroniclers; one or two are to be found in romances that may have been among Gerbert's sources.

These dates strengthen the assumption that the textual reference to the Cordeliers and to the castle of Coucy and the allusion to Leopold VI, Duke of Austria, as a living contemporary of the poet are to be taken literally, and that the Continuation of Perceval, therefore, was actually composed between 1226 and 1230.